

REMARKS

In the outstanding Final Office Action, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over ASANO et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0185236) in view of DONAHUE (U.S. Patent No. 7,020,720).

Upon entry of the present amendment, Applicants will have amended claim 1. The herein-contained amendments to claim 1 should not be considered an indication of Applicants' acquiescence as to the propriety of the outstanding rejection. Rather, the herein-contained amendments are presented to advance prosecution and obtain early allowance of the claims.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, assigning a first IP address and a second IP address to the subscriber device. The Advisory Action asserted that DONAHUE teaches forwarding data packets addressed with both a first IP address and a second IP address. The Advisory Action further asserted that Figure 5 of DONAHUE indicates transmittal of a request packet including both a source IP address and a destination IP address as teaching the combination of features recited in claim 1. However, in claim 1 two distinct IP addresses are assigned to a single subscriber device. That is, a packet including a source IP address for an originating device and destination IP address for a receiving device in DONAHUE does not disclose these features in the manner asserted in the in the Advisory Action. DONAHUE merely teaches a publicly routable address and a private address, each of which are not used together, but rather are used in the alternative. Accordingly, DONAHUE does not teach or suggest forwarding a data packet addressed with both a first IP address and a second IP address from a subscriber device, in which both the first IP address and the second IP address are assigned to the subscriber device, as in claim 1.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the first IP address is compliant with a first protocol implemented by the first IP network, and that the second IP address is compliant with a second protocol distinct from the first protocol implemented by the second IP network. That is, a subscriber device as recited in claim 1 is assigned and addressed by two distinct IP addresses complying with two different protocols, a first protocol implemented by a first IP network and a second protocol implemented by a second IP network. The Advisory Action asserted that the claims did not indicate whether the first IP address and the second IP address were of the same type or of a different type and cites DONAHUE as teaching a gateway assigning a public IP address to a host (which has a privately routable IP address). However, DONAHUE does not teach or suggest that a first IP address is compliant with a first protocol implemented by a first IP network nor that a second IP address is compliant with a second protocol distinct from the first protocol implemented by a second IP network, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Advisory Action further asserted that the combination of features recited in claim 1 may be interpreted as an internal communication within a single network. However, both prior to and upon entry of the present amendment, claim 1 recites a first IP network and a second IP network. To address a packet with both a first IP address and a second IP address for a single subscriber device associated with a single network to achieve internal network communication would not serve to accomplish or further any conceivable purpose. Rather, addressing a packet with two IP addresses in the manner suggested by the Examiner would render a network less functional, as either IP address would result in packet delivery to the same subscriber device internal to the network.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is allowable over ASANO in view of DONAHUE.

Claim 8 is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. For example, neither ASANO nor DONAHUE teach or suggest receiving a DHCP response from a DHCP server, through a destination device that includes a second subscriber IP address associated with a destination network, as in claim 8. Further, neither ASANO nor DONAHUE teach or suggest sending a DHCP response through the IP network to an originating device using a first subscriber IP address, enabling the originating device to obtain a second subscriber IP address from the DHCP response and forward subsequent data packets addressed with both the first subscriber IP address and the second subscriber IP address, as in claim 8.

Claim 18 is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1 and 8, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. For example, neither ASANO nor DONAHUE teach or suggest a second DHCP server in a second IP network that receives a DHCP request from the originating device through the at least one edge device and allocates a second subscriber IP address to the originating device, as in claim 18. In addition, neither ASANO nor DONAHUE teach or suggest that a second subscriber IP address is associated with a second IP network, as in claim 18. Moreover, neither ASANO nor DONAHUE teach or suggest that an originating device forwards data packets with both the first subscriber IP address and the second subscriber IP address, as in claim 18.

Claims 2-7, 9-17, and 19-26 are allowable at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claims 1, 8 and 18, as well as for additional reasons related to

their own recitations. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Keith ALLEN et al.

Joshua M. Povner
Reg. #42,086

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

August 22, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191